[2nd November 1931

(*d*) whether it is a fact that the circular was withdrawn by the Collector of Chittoor;

(*e*) whether it is a fact that the Government made an enquiry into the matter of the emergent order; and

(*f*) whether it is a fact that the said emergent order was cancelled and, if so, why and under what circumstances?

A.—(*a*), (*b*) & (*c*) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to clauses (*a*), (*b*) & (*c*) of his question No. 436.

(*d*) The Tahsildar's circular was withdrawn under the instructions of the Collector.

(*e*) On the circular coming to their notice the Government called for a report of the circumstances in which it was issued.

(*f*) The circular [a] was withdrawn under the instructions of the Collector as being unauthorized, as soon as it came to his notice.

Alleged order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, by the District Magistrate, Chittoor, against certain vakils.

* 455 *Q.*—Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that an order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, was passed on 12th July 1931, against certain vakils of Chittoor, for having started picketing in the Kattumanchi toddy shop;

(*b*) whether the District Collector passed an order under section 144, after issuing a notice to them;

(*c*) whether the Government will lay the text of the order on the table of the House;

(*d*) whether there were any instructions given by the District Magistrate to the vakils for picketing, and if so, what they are;

(*e*) whether the District Collector passed an order prohibiting all people from picketing within a radius of five miles from Chittoor, and if so, why; and

(*f*) whether there was an order passed by the District Magistrate or the Sub-Magistrate of Chittoor, at his direction?

A.—(*a*), (*b*), (*c*) & (*e*) The hon. Member is referred to the order, dated 12th July 1931, which was passed by the Sub-Magistrate of Chittoor and not by the District Magistrate. A copy [b] of it is placed on the table.

(*d*) The Government have no information.

(*f*) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to clause (*a*) of question No. 449.

---

[a] Printed as Appendix I on page 456 infra.

[b] Printed as Appendix II on pages 456-457 infra.

2nd November 1931]

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—"With reference to the answer to clause (*d*) of this question, may I know whether the Government made enquiries to ascertain whether such instructions were issued?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:— "I do not think the Government made any enquiries."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—"In view of the fact that there was this question asking for information, may I know why the Government did not make enquiries?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:— "It was not thought that any enquiry was needed."

Alleged ill-treatment of the Adi-Dravidas of the villages of Koothapal and Krishnasamudram by the caste Hindus.

* 456 *Q.*—Mr. H. M. Jagannatham: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that in the last week of June 1931 an attempt was made by caste Hindus in the villages of Koothapal and Krishnasamudram, Trichinopoly district, to coerce the Adi-Dravidas of the places to sign a declaration to the effect that they would wear clothes only above the knee, use no vessels except those made of clay, abstain from sending their children to schools, and not wear any jewellery made of gold or silver;

(*b*) whether his attention has been drawn to the further fact that owing to the refusal of the Adi-Dravidas to sign the above declaration, the caste Hindus molested a large number of them, causing injuries to some, who had to be treated in the hospitals;

(*c*) what steps were taken by the local police authorities to bring the offenders to book and afford relief to the beaten Adi-Dravidas; and

(*d*) whether the Government will be pleased to appoint a court of enquiry to investigate this matter?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) As the riot which occurred at Koothapal on the 17th June 1931, between caste Hindus and Adi-Dravidas is the subject of criminal case pending before the Sub-divisional Magistrate, Trichinopoly, the Government are unable to answer the question in detail at present.

(*c*) Thirty-eight persons have been charged by the police and the trial is proceeding.

(*d*) The matter is already under judicial enquiry.

Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai:—"May I know when the trial actually started in this case?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur:— "I must ask for notice of the question."